

REMARKS

Claims 1-8 are pending in the application. By this paper, claims 1, 4 and 8 have been amended. Reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-8 is respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, paragraph 2, as being indefinite for reciting the limitation "the platform" in line 9. By this paper, claim 4 has amended to delete this recitation and improve the definiteness of the claim. Accordingly, removal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112 is respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over combinations of U.S. patent number 6,233,325 to Frech, et al. ("Frech"), U.S. patent number 5,007,076 to Blakely ("Blakely"), U.S. patent number 5,652,789 to Miner, U.S. patent number 5,497,414 to Bartholomew.

Introduction

In one preferred embodiment of the present invention each subscriber can choose from a plurality of screening options including recorded caller name screening and calling party number screening, both of which involve placing a call to the called party from network equipment of the telecommunications system. Claim 8 recites an additional screen list option. The subscriber also has the option of disabling any one or all of the screening options. The recorded caller name screening feature asks the caller to state his or her name so that it can be recorded. The recording is played back to the subscriber who can then decide whether to accept the call or dispose of it in some other manner. The calling party number (or Caller ID) screening option allows the calling party's number to be spoken to the subscriber who can then decide whether to accept the call or have it routed to a default destination such as voice mail, for example. In the screening list option, a screening list contains a list of telephone numbers which may be

added to or deleted from and which will be automatically screened without a call being placed to the called party.

Implementation of these screening options is under complete control of the subscriber using a subscriber profile. In one embodiment, the subscriber profile is stored in the network and retrieved upon receipt of a call to the subscriber. During call processing, the subscriber profile is used to control call flow to implant one, two or more (in the case of claim 8, for example) of these call screening options. Claims 1 and 8 have been amended to emphasize the use of the subscriber profile to control the call processing method, and that the subscriber profile defines call screening information for the called party.

The primary reference

In contrast, Frech fails to show, describe or suggest use of a subscriber profile. The office action asserts that the claim 1 limitation of "retrieving a subscriber profile for the called party" is met by Frech FIG. 1, elements 4 and 5. However, these method steps merely show sending a termination attempt request from the terminating switch to the SCP in the system and responding with a call forward message from the SCP to the switch. The specification at column 5, lines 54-56, does not add more detail, and certainly makes no mention of a subscriber profile which defines call screening information for the called party. The additionally-cited references do not provide the missing teaching.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-8 are allowable over the cited references. Withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 1-8 is respectfully requested.

Double Patenting

Claims 1-3 and 8 stand rejected under the doctrine of obviousness type double patenting. According to the office action, these claims are unpatentable over claims 1-3 of U.S. patent number 6,631,182.


Application no. 10/639,610
Amendment dated: March 2, 2005
Reply to office action dated: December 2, 2004

Reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested. It is submitted that the claims of the present application define a method of substantially different scope than, for example, independent claim 1 of the conflicting patent. While they relate to similar processes, the claimed method steps are quite different. For example, claim 1 of the conflicting patent recites "a platform" which is used for call processing. This structural detail is missing from the claims of the present application. Accordingly, withdrawal of the double patenting rejection is respectfully requested.

However, if this rejection is maintained, Applicant stands ready to submit a Terminal Disclaimer in obviation of the rejection.

With this response, the application is believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the examiner deem a telephone conference to be of assistance in advancing the application to allowance, the examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,



John G. Rauch
Registration No. 37,218
Attorney for Applicant

March 2, 2005
BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. BOX 10395
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60610
(312) 321-4200